

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT TACOMA

KURT ANGELONE,
Plaintiff,

v.

MICHAEL FURST, *et al*,
Defendants.

Case No. C07-5538RJB-KLS

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION REQUESTING COURT-
APPOINTED COUNSEL AND
PRO SE ATTORNEYS LIST

This matter has been referred to Magistrate Judge Karen L. Strombom pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), Local Rules MJR 3 and 4, and Rule 72 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The case is before the Court on plaintiff's filing of a motion requesting that his application for court-appointed counsel be sent to the screening committee of the Federal Bar Association, and that he be provided with a "list 'pool'" of attorneys names and addresses who take cases on a *pro bono* basis, and which he believes the Court possesses. (Dkt. #86). After reviewing plaintiff's motion and the balance of the record, the Court finds and orders as follows:

In his motion, plaintiff requests that this Court send his attached application for court-appointed counsel (Dkt. #86-2) to the Federal Bar Association's screening committee, so it can be determined if an attorney should be appointed for him in this matter. Plaintiff asserts that the Federal Bar Association has a procedure for appointing counsel in certain civil rights cases, and that if the screening committee thereof decides that an attorney should be appointed, it makes a recommendation to the Court that such occur. If


1 the Court approves, then an attorney is selected from a pool of voluntary attorneys, who are willing to
2 take the case on a *pro bono* basis.

3 It appears, however, that plaintiff forgets he previously had filed two motions to appoint counsel,
4 both of which this Court denied. (Dkt. #16, #33, #42, and #46). Plaintiff has provided the Court with no
5 new reasons why appointment of counsel in this matter is now warranted. Nor does the Court find any.
6 Given that, according to plaintiff, under the Federal Bar Association's procedures the Court in any event
7 would make the final decision regarding appointment of counsel, forwarding the application as suggested
8 by plaintiff would be moot. This does not stop plaintiff from directly contacting that organization or any
9 other legal organization, though, in an attempt to find *pro bono* counsel on his own.

10 As to plaintiff's second request – a copy of the Court's "list 'pool'" of attorneys, along with their
11 addresses, who would be willing to take cases on a *pro bono* basis – no such Court list exists.
12 Accordingly, for the foregoing reasons, plaintiff's motion (Dkt. #86) hereby is DENIED.

13 The Clerk is directed to send a copy of this Order to plaintiff and counsel for defendants.

14 DATED this 8th day of July, 2008.

15
16
17 

18 Karen L. Strombom
19 United States Magistrate Judge
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28